REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of the presented claims are in condition for allowance.

I. IN THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner notes that trademarks used in the Specification should be capitalized wherever they appear and accompanied by the appropriate generic terminology. The Applicants have made every effort in previous responses to appropriately designate every trademark of which they are aware in the Specification, and believe that all trademarks appearing in the Specification are now appropriately designated. The Examiner indicates that the objection to the Specification is maintained in spite of the Applicants' belief that all trademarks have been appropriately designated; however, the Examiner does not identify any terms in the Specification that require correction. If the Examiner still believes that a particular term used in the Specification is a trademark and has not been designated as such appropriately, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner alert the Applicants to the particular term(s) so that appropriate amendments can be made, if necessary.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2, 4-15, 17-27, AND 29-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-15, 17-27, and 29-31 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Grindrod patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,868,413, issued March 15, 2005, hereinafter referred to as "Grindrod") in view of the Sluiman et al. patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,590,589, issued July 8, 2003, hereinafter "Sluiman"). In response, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 14, and 26 in order to more clearly recite aspects of the present invention. Claims 10 and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to the fact that Grindrod and Sluiman, singly or in any permissible combination, fail to teach or suggest the novel

invention of enabling customization of a rule-based application in a deployment environment, as recited in Applicants' independent claims 1, 14 and 26.

By contrast, the cited portions of Grindrod at most teach that business rules may be customized at design time. In other words, Grindrod teaches a method for customizing business rules prior to use in a deployment environment. For instance, Grindrod teaches that a customized business rule is preferably not enabled "until all requisite information has been defined" (Grindrod, column 10, lines 27-31). This would seem to suggest that a business rule cannot be altered or customized while it is enabled (*i.e.*, deployed in a runtime environment).

The portion of Grindrod that the Examiner cites to illustrate the teaching of customization in a deployment or run-time environment (*i.e.*, column 7, lines 39-44) merely describes various user interfaces for authoring business rules. This passage says nothing about using these user interfaces to customize business rules in a deployment environment. Moreover, nowhere else in Grindrod is it taught or suggested that customization of a business rule is enabled in a deployment environment, as recited in Applicants' independent claims 1, 14, and 26.

Likewise, Sluiman also fails to teach or suggest customizing a rule-based application in a deployment environment, as recited in Applicants' independent claims 1, 14 and 26. Thus, Grindrod in view of Sluiman fails to teach or suggest enabling customization of a rule-based application in a deployment environment, as recited by Applicants' claims 1, 14 and 26. Specifically, Applicants' claims 1, 14 and 26 positively recite:

> 1. A method of customizing a rule-based application, the method comprising:
> designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template, the customizable element being selected by an end-user;
> compiling said customizable element into at least one object to form a ruleset;
>
> parsing said set to detect said customizable element designated as a customizable template; and
>
> enabling customization of said rule-based application in a deployment environment. (Emphasis added)

14. A system for customizing a rule-based application, the system comprising:
means for designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template, the customizable element being selected by an end-user;
means for compiling said customizable element into at least one object to form a ruleset;

means for parsing said set to detect said customizable element designated as a customizable template; and

means for enabling customization of said rule-based application in a deployment environment. (Emphasis added)

26. A computer-readable medium comprising at least one of: a non-volatile medium, or a volatile medium for storing software instructions for customizing a rule-based application, which when executed by a processor perform the steps of:
designating a customizable element of a set as a customizable template, the customizable element being selected by an end-user;
compiling said customizable element into at least one object to form a ruleset;

storing said ruleset;

parsing said set to detect said customizable element designated as a customizable template; and

enabling customization of said rule-based application in a deployment environment. (Emphasis added)

Since Grindrod and Sluiman both fail to teach or suggest enabling customization of a rule-based application in a deployment environment, Grindrod in view of Sluiman does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicants' claims 1, 14 and 26. Moreover, dependent claims 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15, 17-22, 24-25, 27, and 29-31 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 14 and 26 and recite additional features. As such, and for at least the exact same reason set forth above, the Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15, 17-22, 24-25, 27, and 29-31 are also not obvious and are allowable.

Therefore, Applicants contend that claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-15, 17-22, 24-27 and 29-31 are patentable over Grindrod in view of Sluiman and, as such, fully satisfy the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-15, 17-22, 24-27 and 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicants submit that all of the presented claims fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §103. Consequently, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring the maintenance of the final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Kin-Wah Tong, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

5/21/08

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702

Kin-Wah Tong, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,400
(732) 530-9404